

A
DISCOURSE
ON THE
NATURE and END
OF THE
LORD's SUPPER;

Wherein is shewn,

In Opposition to Dr. *Warburton*,

THAT

It neither is, nor can be, of the Nature

OF

A FEAST on the SACRIFICE.

*Si quid asperius dixerim, id non meis moribus, sed illius
insolentia, qui bonos auctores violat, ascribas; nostri
lenitatem, at stulta est clementia duris verbis parcere,
cum ISTE sit meritis deteriora.*

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. PAYNE, at *Pope's Head*, in *Paternoster-Row*. MDCCLVIII.

DISCOURS

ON THE

NATURE AND

OF THE

LANGUAGE

OF THE

INDIANS

OF THE

WEST INDIES



A LIST OF

THE

OF THE

OF THE

I CORINTH. xi. 26.

*For as often as ye eat this bread, and
drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's
death till he come.*

IT is a complaint of some standing in the christian church, that what our blessed Saviour designed to be as it were the *bond of union* among all his disciples, is become (through envy of the devil) the *seed of dissension*; and that, which was originally intended for a public testimony of our *agreement in one common faith*, is by a strange perversion made the *distinguishing* badge of some *particular persuasion*; an instrument of *discord*; and the fruitful source of *strife* and *debates*: and that not through any obscurity which layeth upon the face of the ordinance itself, which, to those who are content to be wise not above what is written, is plain and easy to be understood; but partly through extreme ignorance on one side, and lettered pride on the other, it had been involved in the utmost obscurity and darkness; and such strange notions were grafted thereupon, as made it necessary for men to be put in mind,* that

A 2

The

‘ The Lord’s Supper being an institution of
 ‘ Christ himself, and not of any of their fel-
 ‘ low christians, they must seek in *his* words,
 ‘ and the declarations of his *Apostles*, for all
 ‘ that is contained in it, or can be necessary
 ‘ toward a due partaking of it.’

But as if the recalling men back to *Scripture*, and exhorting them from *thence only* to take their notions of a *scripture duty*, were in and of itself a grievous crime, a monstrous outcry was immediately raised against THE AUTHOR, and the press swarmed with *Answers* (as they were called) to his PLAIN and useful ACCOUNT *of the nature and end of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper*. Not one of which (so well as I remember) that had the least shadow of argument in it, went without a full or sufficient reply: and by this means the controversy was drawn out to a considerable length. But it is now near twenty years since the *great Author* was left in full possession of every argument he had made use of, the several cavils against his book having been fully answered, and thoroughly confuted.

Though the *same leaven* still continuing to work, hath lately burst forth through a *celebrated writer*, famous for his *love of paradox*, and *gross abuse* of every one that differs from him, or that he is pleased to differ from, in matters of *mere speculative opinion only*; and with

with a peculiar * *rudeness* of expression, and † *absurdity* of argumentation, he hath charged the *Author of the Plain Account* with, in a manner, wholly mistaking the nature and end of the *Lord's Supper*; the design of which, according to this *GOLIATH* in learning and science, is not so much the solemn and religious remembrance of Christ and of his death (as the *EVANGELISTS* and *St. PAUL* describe it to be) as it is, that we may *feast upon the sacrifice of the cross*, and thereby have all the ‡ *benefits of Christ's death and passion* conveyed

* One would wonder by what *force of invention* the Author of the *Plain Account* was enabled to deduce this conclusion, [that the *religious remembrance* of Christ, and of his death, was the end of the *Lord's Supper*.] But we often see, that where force is wanting, a *little matter of address* will supply its place. The fourth proposition worked the machine as he would have it, &c. *Warburton's Sermons*, vol. ii. p. 56, 57.

† He hath taken away its *specific* nature, and left it nothing but its *generic*. He hath excluded the idea of a *feast after the sacrifice*, and confined us to the notion of a mere *memorial*, or *remembrance*. *Id. ibid.* p. 54.

The very reverse of which is true; for supposing for argument's sake, that our Lord designed this Sacrament to be an *exact parallel* to the *Paschal Supper* in every particular throughout, yet it will by no means follow from thence, that the idea of a *feast after the sacrifice* (as he calls it) was the *specific* nature of this service, because that was common to the *Paschal Supper* with every other supper, which was at any time eaten within the walls of *Jerusalem*: and therefore this was really its *generic* nature (if we must talk in such *affected* language) whereas its *specific* nature consisted in this, that it was eaten in *memory*, &c. &c.

‡ *Id. ibid.* p. 52.

conveyed to us; or, as he expresses it elsewhere, that we may * *thereby receive the seal of pardon, and be restored to our lost inheritance.*

The bare mention of which to those, who ever read the holy Scriptures with any tolerable share of attention, or know what kind of sacrifice that of the Cross is therein represented to be, is alone a sufficient confutation of it: for the Scriptures inform us, † *That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in REMEMBRANCE of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in REMEMBRANCE of me. Immediately after which the Apostle subjoins, by way of explanation of the whole, the words of the Text, For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come.*

Which words appear to me so plain and clear, as not to stand in need of any comment; and the whole meaning of them is fully expressed in that answer of our Church Catechism to this question, *Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained? viz. For the continual*

* Warburton, *ibid.* p. 103.
24, 25.

† 1 Cor. xi. 23,

continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby. It was not, that we might feast upon that sacrifice, or have the benefits thereof conveyed to us by this holy Rite; but that we should be continually reminded of both. Or in other words: it was ordained not for the *participation*, but the *commemoration* of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and of the benefits thence arising to the Church of God.

But saith this *acute discerner*, * ' We see ' in the very form of celebration all the marks ' of a sacrificial supper.' As he hath not vouchsafed to tell us what those marks are, which distinguish a *sacrificial* from *any other* supper, and as we have only his bare word for the assertion, without any sort of proof to support it, we must content ourselves, for the present, with simply denying it, and pass on to another assertion of his, which through *the violence of his opposition* to the PLAIN ACCOUNT he hath blundered out in direct *contradiction* to the sacred WORD OF GOD.

These are his words: † — ' In those ' ages of the world, when victims made so ' great a part of the religion both of *Jews* and ' *Gentiles*, the sacrifice was *always* followed ' by a religious *feasting on the thing offered*.' [From whence he would infer, that since the death of CHRIST was a *sacrifice*, it must necessarily

* Warburton, *ibid.* p. 44.

† *Id.* *ibid.* p. 43.

cessarily be *feasted on* by us.] Whether he be right or no in this assertion, we shall see presently: for LEVITICUS vi. 30. we read, NO SIN-OFFERING, *whereof any of the blood is brought into the tabernacle, to reconcile withal, SHALL BE EATEN.* And HEBREWS xiii. 11, 12. we read, *The bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the Sanctuary, by the High Priest for Sin, are burnt without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate,* From which two passages of Scripture, thus placed together, it appears beyond all possibility of doubt or contradiction, that the death of CHRIST was a sacrifice of *that kind*, which by the law of GOD was expressly *forbidden to be feasted upon.*

Not to take notice of the *extreme ignorance* in the law of MOSES, which this *Demonstrator of his Divine Legation* hath herein betrayed! * For no part of any *sin-offering*, or *trespass-*

* *Levit. vii. 7.* Solenne est Barnabæ — cum Judæum aliquem ritum proposuerit, & ad redemptionis nostræ mysterium deduxerit, tractationem particularem resumere. Hic ergo observat Sacerdotem, cum de Sacrificio comederet, adumbrasse Dominicam passionem non pro suis, sed aliorum peccatis toleratam; *cum universalis sit regula neminem comedere de sacrificio expiatorio, pro peccatis suis, & proprio frui scelere.* Not. ad Barnab. Epist. p. 21. Edit. Antwerp. 1700.

Ex Sacrificio pacifico pars super altaribus adolebatur, pars à Sacerdotibus comedebatur & reliquum à Domino: ex *hostia* autem *piaculari*, tum ex *hostia pro delicto* nihil quidquam comedebat Dominus, &c. *Abarb. Exord. Comment. in Levit.*

trespass-offering, which was offered to make atonement, or procure pardon of their offences to the offerers, ever came to the use of *those*, in whose behalf it was offered; but was *entirely* given to God, and *wholly* consumed in his service. If the offerer was a *lay-man*, it was *partly burnt* upon the altar, and *partly eaten* by the *Priests*, as being God's * household family and servants, and therefore to be maintained out of his goods, and as it were at his expence: † if the offerer was a *Priest* himself, or the whole body of the congregation, it was to be *entirely* burnt. And the reason of this is plain and evident; because had *these sacrifices* been permitted to be *feasted on* by those, in whose behalf they were offered, it could be looked upon as no other, ‡ than a *rejoicing over their iniquity*, and making merry with their sins. The high indecency and

B

abomi-

* Sacerdotes admissionis interioris famuli. *Spencer de Legib. Heb.* lib. iii. Fuerunt primarii Dei Ministri, & illius quasi sumptibus sustentati. Qui cum Dei famuli essent, par erat, ut ejus quasi sumptibus alerentur. *Id. ibid.* Sacerdotibus, ut famulatio Dei, visceratio quædam præbenda fuit. *Outram de Sacrif.*

† *Levit.* iv. Piaculorum, quæ ab universo cætu fiebant, omnium communis era ista lex, ut igni cremarentur. *Abarb.* ubi suprà.

‡ Hinc cautum ne quis eâ victimâ vesceretur, quam pro piaculo faciebat — Id quod a GROTIUS observatum est de *sacris salutaribus* differente. De his inquit licebat post effusum sanguinem privatis, qui obtulerant, eorumque uxoribus ac liberis epulari — Id in oblatione similæ non licebat — Nec in victimis pro peccato, ac delicto, ne de culpâ lætarentur. *Outram de Sacrif.*

abomination of which is too glaring, to need one word more to be said about it.

Feasts indeed *upon sacrifices* were very frequent and familiar things, during the times he speaks of; but then the *sacrifices feasted upon* were of a very *different kind* from that, which the *sacrifice of the Cross* is in the Scriptures represented to be; for this is therein set forth as *SUCH a sacrifice for sin* [or sin-offering] as by an express law was *forbidden to be feasted upon*, as I have just now shewn ye: and the *ONLY sacrifices* permitted to be *feasted on* by those, *in whose behalf* they were *offered*, were what are called *PEACE-OFFERINGS*, by which *no expiation* of any sort was designed, *no atonement* was intended to be made, *no pardon* of offences procured to the offerers: but they were * *common acts only* of religious worship and homage, whereby they did acknowledge the Lord for their God; in like manner as *vocal* prayer and praise *now* are, which have succeeded to the *material oblations* of victims on the Altar.

And to come closer to the point we are upon: † the *sprinkling of the blood* upon the altar

* *Sacrificia pacifica sancta levia. Maimonides, More Nevochim.*

† *Levit. iii. Eorum autem, quæ & oblata, & ritu sacro consumpta erant — Alia erant ex inanimis, alia autem ex animantibus, omnia fere ex eis lecta, quæ in humano*

altar round about, and *burning the fat* of the cawl, and of the inwards and kidneys, with all the fat which was on them, and other ceremonies used in the oblation of all *Peace-offerings*, which were the *only* kind of sacrifices permitted to be *feasted on by the people*, was exactly the same kind of religious service, *i. e.* it was of the same intention, as *saying Grace* (as we call it) *before meat*, is now among us. It was no other, than a kind of *sanctification* of the feast, and a virtual acknowledgment, that God was the author and giver of all good things, of whose bounty they were going then to partake in their *feasts*, or *entertainments*, or *meals*; for this withal is to be noted, that *feasting upon the Sacrifice* does not always imply the having a *large* or elegant *entertainment* for a number of persons, but even their *common meals*, which they eat for their *daily sustenance*, were to be thus sanctified by the *oblation* of the blood and fat *upon the altar*.

Accordingly, while the people of *Israel* sojourned in the wilderness, and the tabernacle of the congregation was at no very great distance from any part of the camp, * they were

B 2

not

humano victu erant. Quippe quæ sibi Deus dari voluit, ut eorum Domino ac Datori, quæ ad vitam sustinendam pertinent. *Outram*, p. 84.

* *Levit. xvii.* Quoniam sacra salutaria ab ipsis offerentibus ad sacras epulas adhibita erant, *Zebachim* quoque passim dicta sunt, nempe *victimæ ad convivia cæse*.
Qualia,

not allowed to partake of any *animal food*, but what had been *thus sanctified* by the *oblation* of the blood, and of the fat, &c. but when they came to dwell in the *Promised Land*, if the place of their habitation was *too far distant* from the appointed place of worship, so that they could not *ordinarily* resort thither, they were permitted to partake of *any clean food*, without the observation of that previous ceremony, which was never deemed to mean any thing more, as I said, than *saying Grace* does now with us; it was no other than a begging of God to *sanctify* that food they were going to partake of, to the uses for which he gave it, *viz.* the refreshment and nourishment of their *bodily strength*; and it was a *virtual* acknowledgment, that all they enjoyed flowed from his bounty and goodness, to which they stood indebted for all they had or were.

Qualia, dum populus in desertis in viciniâ Sanctuarii degeret, toties celebranda erant convivia, quoties quis quadrupedem ullam cæderet, quæ sacrificio idonea erat; omnis enim pecudis ex bovillo, ovillo, caprinôque genere ibi cæfæ sanguis in aram fundendus erat, extâque in ea adolenda. Ut nisi de pecude immolatâ nemini planè in desertis caro pecorina gustanda esset. *Id.* p. 116.

Ea quippe veterum sententia fuit etiam ante legem è *Sinai* datam, nec accommodatiùs commemorari, nec quidem faciliùs impetrari Dei gratiam potuisse in rebus prosperis dandis elucentem, quam rerum a Deo acceptarum libatione aliquâ Deo factâ. Quod ipsum sacris salutaribus — Ante legem sacram *Hebræis* traditam, fieri solitis ortum dedisse videatur. Eoque apud profanas gentes eadem sententia tandem valuit, ut, nisi pane ac vino diis libato, mensis accumbere nefas ducerent. *Id. ibid.*

were *. The like custom prevailed even in the *Gentile world*, wherein it was thought unlawful to eat of any *sett meal*, till they had first offered a part thereof to the Gods they worshipped.

If therefore the *Lord's Supper* be really (as this celebrated writer pretends) a *feast on the Sacrifice of the Cross*, it will follow that the death of Christ was no other than a *Peace-offering*, by which no sort of atonement, propitiation, or expiation was effected; which I presume he will scarce have the hardiness to affirm: or if he will allow, that the death of Christ upon the Cross was a *sacrifice for sin*, as St. PAUL † assures us it was, then it cannot be *feasted on* by us, because *no sin-offering* was to be *eaten*, or *feasted on* by those, in *whose behalf* it was offered. The sum therefore of my argument, against this writer's *absurd* notion of the Lord's Supper being a *feast on*

* Gentilibus familiare erat carnes edendas ritu aliquo Dæmoni vel Idolo consecrare. Iis id moris erat, ut mensis affidentes partem de pane & vino sumptam in aram — Aut si ara non adesset, in focum aræ vice, injicerent. *Spencer de Leg. Heb.*

Neque victimarum tantum; sed & dapum partem aliquam decerpentes in ignem conjiciebant; epulum diis suis hoc ritu consecrantes. *Id. ibid.*

Deus animalia omnia comedenda coram tabernaculo mactari, & eorum sanguinem super Altare spargi voluit; adeo ut *Israelitæ* in deserto *desiderio*, prout aliæ gentes *idololatriæ* quotidie vescerentur. *Id. ibid.*

† *Heb. x. 12.*

on the sacrifice of the cross, reduced to form, stands thus :

No sin-offerings were permitted to be feasted on by those, in whose behalf they were offered.

But the death of Christ on the cross was a sin-offering, offered in our behalf.

Therefore it cannot be feasted on by us.

Now as there is this obvious, clear, and convincing demonstration of the falsity of this writer's hypothesis, of *the Lord's Supper* being *a feast on the sacrifice of the cross*, it may be a matter of much wonder and surprize, how a man of *common honesty* with his *eyes open*, could espouse a notion, which is so *manifestly contrary* to the doctrine of the holy Scriptures, and in its natural consequences so *very destructive* of all true religion and godliness : for who would at any time refuse himself the pleasures of sin, when he could so easily procure *the benefits of Christ's death and passion, to be conveyed* to him ? Or who would stick at transgressing any of the commandments, when he could so readily *obtain the seal of pardon, and a restoration to his lost inheritance* ? It is indeed a notion, that opens a wide door to *all manner* of licentiousness and sin ; and *therefore* it is, that I thought it not amiss to give ye this brief confutation of the *very ground-work* on which he

he builds, lest the *bare reputation* of his learning and abilities might be the means of seducing any into his scheme: which, had it been a matter of *mere literary* disquisition only, he might have enjoyed in the utmost quiet for me, and have gone on to build one *absurdity* upon another, till he had shewn in the face of all the world, to his friends as well as foes, to his admirers as well as detractors, how very far he was from being *infallible*, and how *justly reprehensible* for his *manner* of treating all who happen to differ from him, or that he is pleased to differ from, in matters of *mere speculation* only, when he himself hath thus *egregiously blundered* about a point of doctrine, in itself not very difficult, and made so very clear and intelligible to all unprejudiced minds, by that excellent performance THE PLAIN ACCOUNT, in *pure opposition* to which he seems to have taken up, and varnished over this almost-forgotten notion of the *feast on the sacrifice*.

But, as if *conscious* to himself of the weakness of the cause he was maintaining, and that a little *artifice* was necessary to prop it for a while, he hath all along in his discourse upon this point, played fast and loose with us, and by constantly changing the terms of a *feast upon*, and *after* the sacrifice, he seems to have intended the securing his retreat in case of an attack, by flying for refuge to this *pitiful quibble*, in which there is something so very
mean

mean and low, as cannot but excite our *utmost contempt*; for who doth not see at first sight, that *feasting upon a sacrifice*, and the partaking of a *feast after* having offered a sacrifice, may be, and actually are, very different things? Because *every feast* a man partook of, *after* he had offered a *sacrifice*, was very far from being the same as *feasting upon* that sacrifice itself: and as every sacrifice was *not always* followed by a feasting upon it, so neither was every feast constantly preceded by an *oblation* of any part thereof; for if the place of their habitation (as I have already observed) was at a very great *distance* from the appointed place of worship, they might *feast according to their liking*, without offering any sacrifice upon God's Altar whatsoever, as any one may see, by consulting the xiith chapter of the book of *Deuteronomy*.

However, such is the extraordinary *candour* and *ingenuity* of this celebrated writer, that he hath been pleased to intimate an objection, which he apprehended might be started against his notion of the *Lord's Supper being a feast on the sacrifice of the Cross*, which doth but still more betray the *smallness of his acquaintance* with the point of doctrine he hath undertaken to treat of. — These are his words: * — ‘ It is true the injunction of *doing it in remembrance* implies, that the celebration was to be continually repeated; which it must be owned

* Warburton, *ibid.* p. 45.

owned was not the practice in the *feasts after the sacrifice*; on which, as we say, this holy Rite was modelled. — The *Paschal Supper*, I presume, this author will allow to be a *feast after the sacrifice*, and to which he hath told us this holy Rite bore a very near resemblance (for, saith he, it was intended to bear the same relation to the *Sacrifice of the Cross*, which the *Paschal Supper* bore to the *oblation of the Paschal Lamb*) the *Paschal Supper*, I say, was *repeated* year by year continually, and was * *commanded in the Law* so to be. And all other *feasts upon sacrifice* were constantly repeated so often, as any of *that kind* of sacrifice was offered, *on which* they were allowed to *feast*; which this Writer, before he had presumed to dictate in the manner he hath done, should have known were *Peace-offerings only*; the whole design of which was, either to keep up their general league of Amity with God (not to make *atonement*, or any thing like it) or else to commemorate some special goodness of God, shewn toward the *offerers*, and to *thank* him for the same; or lastly, they were applied as *rites of supplication* for good things to come, and which they might think they stood in need of.

Now the *annual Paschal Lamb* can be ranked under no other than *this species* of sacrifice, viz. *Peace-offerings*, of which Jesus and his disciples had just then been eating, at the very

C time

* *Exodus* xii. 14. xiii. 10, &c.

time of instituting the *Lord's Supper*. The *rites of oblation*, i. e. the Priests taking the blood, and pouring it out or sprinkling it, and the fat with the inwards being burnt upon the Altar, were *peculiar to that age* of the world, and in *these* offerings was considered at that very time, as I have already shewn ye, to be no other than a * *more solemn sanctification* of the *feast*, to which vocal prayer and thanksgiving now fully correspond. — The very end and design of the *Paschal Solemnity* was, to keep up a perpetual *memorial* of that great mercy of God shewn toward the children of *Israel*, in saving them from destruction, when all the first-born of *Egypt* were destroyed, and by that means rescuing them from their bondage. This *Commémoration* they had then been celebrating; and in conformity to it our Saviour commands his disciples to celebrate a *like commemoration* of himself; of his *body broken*, and *blood shed* for their sakes, by which such a redemption would be wrought for them, as that, of which they had been celebrating the *memorial*, was only a faint type or shadow of. The bread they had been eating was considered as, and called by them

* Neque enim aliâ de causâ, nisi ut comederetur, victima Paschalis mactabatur. *Maimon. de Sacrif. Pasch.* And as the same author observes, Nulla adhibebantur isti sacrificio libamina; therefore the materials, of which the Lord's Supper consists, had not even any of *these rites* accompanying them at the *original institution*, and therefore cannot be a *feast on that sacrifice*, of which they made no part.

them the *bread of Affliction*, which their fathers did eat in the land of *Egypt*; hereafter they were to consider it as the figure, or representation of their Master's *body broken*, and the Wine as the *memorial* of his *blood shed* for them (and therefore it was, that he called them by the names of his body and blood) and this solemnity they were constantly to keep up, thereby, as St. PAUL expresses it in my text, *shewing the Lord's death till he come*.

Allowing therefore what this writer saith *,
 ' That the divine institutor of this holy Sacra-
 ' ment intended it should bear the same rela-
 ' tion to his Sacrifice on the Cross, which the
 ' Paschal Supper bore to the oblation of the
 ' *Paschal Lamb*, yet it will by no means fol-
 low from thence, that therefore the *Lord's*
Supper must have the nature of *a feast on the*
Sacrifice of the Cross, because the *annual Pas-*
chal Supper was no other than a MEMORIAL
 of the *original Passover*, and of the benefits
 thence arising to the people of *Israel*, not the
actually feasting upon that Passover itself: in
 like manner the *Lord's Supper* now is a me-
 morial, or for the remembrance of the *sacrifice*
 of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which
 we receive thereby, not the *actually feasting*
upon that sacrifice itself, nor the *real partici-*
pation of the benefits thence arising to the
 Church of God. Not to repeat what I have
 already given ye full demonstration of, viz,
 C 2 that

* Warburton, p. 44.

that the *sacrifice of the Cross* being a *sacrifice for sin*, therefore *cannot be feasted on* by us, in whose behalf it was offered.

But farther. — This celebrated writer saith †, ‘ It hath been hitherto esteemed an essential Canon of true criticism, that in order to form a right judgment of the *specific* nature of any ordinance, or institution of ancient times, we should have a special regard to the notions, manners, and customs of those times.’ In pursuance of this *canon of true criticism*, which he so highly and justly approves, I have shewn ye, that the *only sacrifices* permitted to be *feasted on* by the offerers, or owners of the sacrifice, were *Peace-offerings*, which were no other than *common rites* of religious *worship*: but as the *Death of Christ* was *not* of that species of sacrifice, therefore I conclude in opposition to this writer, that the *Lord’s Supper* cannot be a *feast on this Sacrifice*. I have shewn ye likewise, that no *sin-offering* was ever permitted to be *feasted on* by those, in whose behalf it was offered; and as the death of Christ was a *sin-offering*, I conclude, in pursuance of the same *essential canon of true criticism*, that therefore likewise it *cannot be feasted on* by us, in whose behalf it was offered. And as these conclusions necessarily arise in pursuance of *his own maxim*, he cannot, I presume, find fault with that *method*.

† Warburton, p. 81.

method of examination of his Doctrine, which I have hitherto pursued,

He hath been pleased likewise to say in another place †, that ‘ This he takes to be the only remaining question [between himself and the Author of the *Plain Account*, since they are agreed in the proposition, that Jesus SUFFICIENTLY declared the whole of what he understood by his last supper] viz. whether the disciples of Jesus (as it is agreed their master did not in express terms call this Rite a feast upon a sacrifice) could collect from the whole of the circumstances attending the institution, that it was indeed of the nature of such a feast.’ — He, in a way that we may call peculiarly his own, supposes that he may fairly conclude, that the disciples might, and did collect that the last supper was of the nature of a feast upon sacrifice; I on the contrary, from a few plain passages of Scripture, which speak of the several sorts of sacrifice, and the feasts upon one particular species of them, have shewn ye, that this is absolutely impossible. Let us therefore follow him to another topic of argumentation, he hath been pleased to make use of, in order to support this fanciful notion of a feast on the sacrifice, and try what we can collect of St. PAUL’s sense in this matter, who hath occasionally spoken at large concerning it.

And

† Warburton, p. 58.

And from whom I doubt not to make it appear very clearly, that the *Lord's Supper* is *no other* than a solemn and *religious memorial* of the death of CHRIST; and being performed *as such*, in obedience to his command, becomes an *act of homage* to him, whereby we do declare ourselves *his* disciples, and own him for *our Lord* and Master; whom we by this *holy Rite* (if we are sincere and honest in our attendance upon it) declare ourselves ready to obey in *all things*; for by *doing this in remembrance of him*, because he hath commanded us so to do, we do in effect declare our obligation, and readiness to obey all, *whatsoever* He hath commanded: nor shall we find that St. PAUL ever thought of the *Lord's Supper* being a *feast on the sacrifice of the cross*, unless we will *suppose*, that he could not possibly compare any two things together, which did not tally to each other in *every respect*, or that he had no notion of any *similitude* but what *crawled on all four*. And this very supposition is that mighty *force of argument*, which this writer in his *usual rumbling* manner of expression talks of. But let us see what *force* there is really in it.

Now † St. PAUL was desirous of dissuading the *Corinthian* converts from going to *feast* with their heathen neighbours *on what had been*

† 1 *Corinth.* x. 14, &c.

been sacrificed to Idols, in the Idol Temples, which he judged to be no less than an act of Religious homage to, and worshipping of the Idols, those sacrifices had been offered to : and as the *medium* of his argument makes mention of a *religious feast* they had among themselves, which they partook of in obedience to the command of JESUS CHRIST, and as such was an act of homage to him ; and that therefore it was a high absurdity (as well as iniquity) in them, to pay the same outward veneration to an Idol, which they were used to pay to Christ. And to strengthen his argument the apostle adds, *Behold Israel after the flesh : are not they, which eat of the sacrifices, partakers of the Altar ?* * The true meaning of which is, that they are to be deemed worshippers of that God, to whom the Altar was dedicated, equally with those who had offered the sacrifice, which (I would beg you to remember) could be a *Peace-offering only* ; for of such alone were THE PEOPLE allowed to eat, or to feast upon.

But

* Enimvero sicut communis mensa mutuam ferè indicare solet hominum inter se concordiam, ita qui victimis vescabantur, aræ participes censebantur, communique cum Deo mensâ uti. Quippe ara mensa Dei dicitur, ejusque fructus Dei Cibus ; ita ut quos Deus aræ suæ participes faceret, hos sibi amicitia quadam conjunctos esse significaret. Quæ eadem quoque ratio fuit, quare qui illa comedebant, quæ Dæmonibus immolata erant (qui mos profanarum gentium fuit) Dæmonum consortes censerentur. *Outram de Sacrif.* Compare Bishop Patrick on *Exod. xxxiv. 15.*

But it is said *, ' That this argument of St. PAUL must needs suppose a *perfect analogy* between these three [the feast in the Idol temples on the sacrifice there offered up, the *Jewish* feasts on their Peace-offerings, and the Lord's Supper] and that they are all parallel one to another ; or else the argument hath no strength.' In like manner this writer we have to do with, blindly following his leader †, saith, ' If the three feasts, *Jewish*, Pagan, and Christian, had not one common nature, how could the Apostle have inferred, that this Intercommunion was absolutely inconsistent ?' And what *He* means by one common nature he hath told us was, that the *Lord's Supper* is of the *same kind entirely* with their feasts, *i. e. sacrificial, or feasts upon a sacrifice.*

On the contrary I affirm, that if there was an agreement between them in *any one principal circumstance*, without there being a *perfect analogy* between them in *all points*, or *one common nature throughout*, that is ground sufficient for a *comparison* between them, and for St. PAUL's argument founded thereupon : nor is there any the least necessity, in order to make the Apostle's argument compleat, to suppose the *Lord's Supper* considered by him as a *feast on a sacrifice* ; for the taking it in this light only,

* *Cudworth on the Lord's Supper*, cap. iv. sub fine.

† *Warburton*, p. 50.

only, as an *act of religious homage* to Christ, in like manner, as *partaking of the feasts in the Idol temples* was, or would be interpreted at least to be, an *act of religious homage* to that Idol, in whose temple they feasted, was *sufficient* to his purpose, and proved *all* that he aimed at.

The *partaking of the Altar* likewise does not mean the receiving any great, and special *benefits* thereby, such as the *pardon of sin, remission of guilt*, and the like (for this was *not in the least* intended by *those* sacrifices, of which the *people* were allowed to eat, or to *feast upon*) but it was a *general act of communion and fellowship in that worship*, which the *material oblation* of the blood, &c. of the victim was a *special rite* of. Or in other words, it was a *joining in the worship of that God*, as I said before, to *whom the Altar was dedicated*; it was a *public profession* of their being *his* servants and worshippers, whom by this act they did recognize for their Lord and Master; nor was any benefit imagined to arise from hence, other than was common to *every* instance of obedience, whether of a Religious, Moral, or Civil nature.

In like manner when the Apostle saith *,
*Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and
 the table of devils*, his meaning is, ye cannot
 without great *absurdity* pay the same kind of

D

honour

* 1 Cor. x. 21.

honour to Dæmons or Idols, as ye do to Christ; his meaning was not to speak of the *benefits* arising, or supposed to arise from either; but to shew them the *folly* and *iniquity* of doing that, which could be interpreted as no other, than a *communicating in the worship* of an Idol, or some *inferior powers*, when at the same time they desired to be thought worshippers of the *supreme God*, by partaking of the *Lord's table*.—There is no necessity therefore to suppose, these several feasts to have one common nature, *any farther* than that they were *each of them* instances of *worship and homage* to that Being, who was particularly meant to be honoured by them: nor does it, I apprehend, appear in the least from the comparison St. PAUL draws between the Heathenish, Jewish, and Christian feasts, that the *Lord's Supper* must be of the nature of a *feast on the sacrifice*.

Nay more! I do say, that St. PAUL could not consider the *Lord's Supper* under the notion, or as having the nature, of a *feast on the sacrifice*, without being guilty of *self-contradiction*. For St. PAUL hath told us, that * *Christ died for the ungodly*; that he *gave himself for our sins*; that he *appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself*; and that he *was offered to bear the sins of many*. From which and many other passages to be met with in the writings of St. PAUL it is plain, that the *death of Christ upon the Cross* was always considered by

* Rom. v. 6: Gal. i. 4. Heb. ix. 26, 28. xiii. 11, 12.

by him to be of the nature of *those sacrifices for sin, the blood of which was brought into the holy place to reconcile withal*; and therefore by an exprefs law was † *forbidden to be feasted upon*. Not to repeat what I have had occasion more than once to observe to ye, that the *only sacrifices* which could be *feasted upon* by the owners of the sacrifice, or those in whose behalf it was offered, were *Peace-offerings*, by which no sort of *atonement* or *expiation* was made, they were only *common acts* of worship, whereby they did acknowledge the Lord for their God.

And now upon a Review of the whole, what opinion must we entertain either of the *abilities*, or *honesty* of this CELEBRATED WRITER, for having vamped up, in *pure opposition to the PLAIN ACCOUNT*, this almost-forgotten notion of the *feast on the sacrifice of the Cross*, and sending it forth as a most useful and wonderful discovery he had made in the wide compass of his extensive reading, *without reflecting on*, or in the least *perceiving* its utter *inconsistence* with the *word of God*; or if he was *sensible of this*, for having *dared* to assert and publish it. But that ye may have always at hand a short, an easy, and a full confutation of his *whole pompous blunder*, give me leave to repeat, and to leave with ye this one SYLLOGISM.

D 2 No

† Levit. vi. 30.

No sin-offerings were permitted to be feasted on by those, in whose behalf they were offered.

But the death of Christ on the cross was a sin-offering, offered in our behalf.

Therefore it cannot be feasted on by us *.

* The late Dr. WATERLAND hath endeavoured to evade the force of this argument, in his *Review of the doctrine of the Eucharist*, &c. p. 450. by saying, 'That our Lord was a *Sin-offering* and a *Peace-offering* both in one (a sort of sacrifice! I believe, no where to be met with, but in his confused imagination) and that this is plainly taught by St. PAUL, *Ephes. v. 2. Christ hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a SWEET-SMELLING SAVOUR.*' And saith he, 'If the sacrifice of Christ be considered in the Eucharist, under its *most comfortable, most endearing view*, as a *PEACE-OFFERING* (not excluding other views) have we any reason to object against so wise, and so kind an institution? To represent the sacrifice of Christ merely as a *sin-offering*, would be representing nothing but the *melancholy and dismal* part of it, which had not the *sweet odour*, the *sweet-smelling savour* accompanying it. Dr. CUDWORTH's notion of a *sacrificial feast* goes upon the *more delightful view* of it, as St. Paul's also does in the Text before referred to.' — See here! to what *extreme lengths* a violence of opposition will push men, for the sake of serving a present turn! See here! the *orthodox* Dr. Waterland licking up some of the *most virulent spittle* of the SOCINIANS, in a work wrote professedly to guard against, what he was pleased to stigmatize with the name of, *SOCINIAN prejudices*. For this *idle childish talk* of his about the *dismal* and the *delightful view* of Christ's death, proceeds upon the interpretation of a *Socinian* writer, who hath from this Text endeavoured to shew, that the sacrifice of Christ's death was herein considered by St. PAUL as *no other* than a *Peace-offering*, it being said here to be for a *sweet-smelling savour*, which cannot he thinks

thinks be applied to an *expiatory sacrifice*, or *sin-offering*, in which there was not used any *frankincense*, &c. Now LEVITICUS iv. 31. speaking *expressly* of a SIN-OFFERING it is said, *The Priest shall burn the fat upon the Altar for a SWEET SAVOUR unto the Lord, and the Priest shall make atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him.* Whereby alone it appears, that this Phrase is *not peculiar* to PEACE-OFFERINGS; and therefore from hence not the least shadow of a proof arises, that the *sacrifice of Christ's Death* was of the nature of a PEACE-OFFERING. See likewise Dr. *Whilby*, and other Commentators on this Text. — There are several other very blameable particulars in this piece of Dr. *Waterland*: but let him rest in his grave. — Though I cannot help just mentioning the *strange fatality* attending many opponents to the *Plain Account*, who while they were endeavouring to fasten, by forced interpretations, far-fetched consequences, and perpetual misrepresentations, a suspicion of *Socinianism* on the GREAT AUTHOR, have themselves either directly asserted, or by necessary consequence have implied, some *distinguishing tenet* of SOCINUS, or of *his immediate followers*, to be their real belief, or opinion.



F I N I S.

blanks be applied to an expiatory sacrifice, or as offering,
in which there was not shed any innocent blood. New
LXXIV. v. 31. speaking expressly of a sin-offer-
ing, and is said, The Priest shall burn the fat upon the altar
for a sweet savour unto the Lord, and the Priest shall
make atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him.
Whereby alone it appears, that this Phrase is not peculiar
to Peace-offerings; and therefore from hence not
the least shadow of a proof arises, that the sacrifice of
Christ's Death was of the nature of a Peace-offering.
See likewise Dr. Whalley, and other Commentators on
this Text. — There are several other very plausible pec-
uliarities in this piece of Dr. Waterland's; but let him rest
in his grave. — Though I cannot help just mentioning the
strange fatuity attending many opposers to the Plain
Account, who while they were endeavouring to lessen, by
forced interpretations, far-fetched consequences, and per-
petual misrepresentations, a supposition of Satanism on
the Great Author, have themselves either directly
asserted, or by necessary consequence have implied, some
distinguishing mark of Socinianism, or of his immediate fol-
lowers, to be their real belief, or opinion.